

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Derrick Levon Platt,)	Civil Action No.: 4:13-cv-02937-RBH
)	Criminal No.: 4:09-cr-01146-RBH-1
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
United States of America,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Pending before the Court is Derrick Levon Platt’s (“Petitioner’s”) *pro se* Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence (“Motion to Vacate”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. For the following reasons, Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate is dismissed.¹

Petitioner previously filed a Motion to Vacate on November 7, 2011, in which he alleged ineffective assistance of counsel in various particulars. By Order dated April 16, 2013, this Court granted the Government’s Motion for Summary Judgment, dismissed the Motion *with prejudice* and denied a certificate of appealability.

Because Petitioner has previously filed a § 2255 petition which was adjudicated on the merits, the present Motion to Vacate is successive. “[A] prisoner seeking to file a successive application in the district court must first obtain authorization from the appropriate court of appeals.” *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 205 (4th Cir. 2003) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (“A second or successive motion [under this section] must be certified as provided in § 2244 by a panel of the appropriate court of appeals[.]”). In the absence of pre-filing authorization, the district

¹ Because the facts and legal arguments are adequately set forth in the existing record, an evidentiary hearing is not necessary. *United States v. Burton*, 26 Fed. App’x 351 (4th Cir. 2002); *see also United States v. Yearwood*, 863 F.2d 6, 7 (4th Cir. 1988) (recognizing that “[a] hearing is not required . . . on a § 2255 motion if the record of the case conclusively shows that petitioner is entitled to no relief”).

court lacks jurisdiction to consider a motion under § 2255. *See Winestock*, 340 F.3d at 205. The docket does not reflect any such authorization.

Certificate of Appealability

A certificate of appealability will not issue absent “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the court’s assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate *both* that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85. In the instant matter, the Court concludes that Petitioner fails to make the requisite showing of “the denial of a constitutional right.”

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, **IT IS ORDERED** that Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate is **DISMISSED** *without prejudice* to allow the petitioner to seek written permission from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to file a second or successive petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED** because the Petitioner has failed to make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
November 4, 2013